

Planning

Growth & Development

Delegated officer report for planning application

Application no. 143509/FH/2025
Date registered valid: 1 August 2025
Proposal: Erection of a part single, part two storey front and single storey side extension
Address: 6 Fordbank Road, Manchester, M20 2TH
Ward(s): Didsbury West Ward

Applicant: Mr Joe Parsons
Agent (if any): Mr Ian Grainger, Blu Room Architecture
Case officer: Tracie Simpson
Tel: 0161 234 4537
Email: tracie.simpson@manchester.gov.uk

Recommendation: Approve
Date of recommendation: 27th October 2025



Application details

Type of application: Full Householder Application

Development type: Householder

Date of site visit: 13 August 2025

Standard consultations:

No consultations have been printed and sent.

Neighbour notifications

Printed: 7 August 2025 Expired: 29 August 2025

Site notice

No site notice has been produced

Press advert

No press advert had been published

Departure from Development Plan: No

Environmental Statement: Not required

Description of site/building

The application site comprises an early 20th-century two-storey semi-detached dwelling of traditional red brick and render construction, with a tiled pitched roof. The property is located on the west side of Fordbank Road within a predominantly residential area. It benefits from gardens to both the front and rear, with side access and off-road parking provided via a hardstanding driveway to the front. The dwelling features a modest front porch with a sloping roof, as well as existing side and rear extensions.

Characteristic of this house type along Fordbank Road, the property includes a catslide roof to the front gable and a decorative porthole window on the principal elevation, contributing to the architectural rhythm and visual interest of the streetscape.



Listed building: Not applicable

Conservation area: Not applicable

Tree Preservation Order: Not applicable

Description of area

This is primarily a residential area in nature

Description of development

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a part single, part two storey front and single storey side extension



Consultations & Notification Responses

Local residents - as per Appendix 1 - Occupiers of properties surrounding the application site were notified of the proposal. One letter of comments received as part of this proposal as follows:

- If your authority intends to grant permission for this planning application, we recommend you make installation of a minimum of one Swift nest brick a planning condition to provide enhancement for biodiversity.
- Swifts are in trouble, having declined by over 60% in the last 25 years.
- Swifts are now a 'Red-listed' species on the list of Birds of Conservation Concern and a Priority species for the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB).
- Designing for and installing Swift bricks into the fabric of the new building during the construction phase will last the life-time of the building.
- This approach is supported by published guidance from the Royal Institute of British Architects and the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management and NHBC all of which provide clear and detailed guidance on how and where to install bricks.
- Installing integral Swift nest bricks would contribute to the objectives of national legislation and planning policy set out to protect and enhance biodiversity

Policy and Issues

The following policies are considered relevant in the consideration of this application.

- o Unitary Development Plan (UDP) - The UDP has been superseded by the Core Strategy Development Plan.
- o Policy DC1 for Residential Extensions is still considered of relevance, in particular policy DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes.
- o The Manchester Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012-2027 ("the Core Strategy") was adopted by the City Council on 11th July 2012.
- o Policy DM 1 - Development Management
- o Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles
- o Policy EN1 - Design Principles
- o Policy EN 19 - Waste Management
- o The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Places for Everyone Plan (2022 - 2039)

We have assessed the proposal against the following policies of the Places for Everyone Plan.

JP-S1: Sustainable Development
JP-P1 Sustainable Places

This policy outlines how we aim to become one of the most liveable city regions in the world, consisting of a series of beautiful, healthy, and varied places.

We consider this proposal to accord with the principles of this policy.

Principle

Policies SP1 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) seek to ensure that new development enhances or creates character, protects and enhances the built environment; and that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development is appropriate to its context. Policies DC1.1, DC1.2, DC1.3 and DC1.4 of The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 (UDP) relate specifically to residential extensions and set out a number of criteria against which proposals for extensions will be assessed. DC1.5 - The Council will consider on their merits exemptions to the above policies in the case of applications from disabled people who may require particular adaptations to their homes. Although these latter policies are now of some age, they are consistent with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks a high standard of design in new developments which provides a good standard of amenity of all existing and future occupiers.

The principle of allowing residents to extend their homes to provide enlarged or improved accommodation is generally acceptable provided that there is no overriding, undue impact upon either the character of the property or upon the residential and visual amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

In this instance the principle of the proposal is considered acceptable, and it is not believed that there are any factors of sufficient weight in amenity terms that would warrant refusal of the application.

On balance, the proposed extension is deemed to accord with saved policy DC1 of the UDP and policies DM1 and SP1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

History relating to 6 Fordbank Road

Previous planning applications relating to this site as follows:

Planning reference number: 125322/FH/2019 – for the erection of a two storey rear and single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation. This application was approved on 15.01.2020.

Residential Amenity

The applicant is seeking planning permission for the erection of a part single, part two storey front and single storey side extension, which will provide additional living space for the occupants. Comments received during the consultation and notification process, as summarised in this report, did not object to the proposal. However, it was requested that the applicant install an integral Swift nesting brick. An informative note regarding this request has been attached.

The proposed ground floor extension would project approximately 950mm forward of the principal elevation of the dwelling, extending slightly beyond the existing front bay window. The extension would span a width of 4.340m, wrapping around the front of the property and continuing rearwards

by 3.225m, while maintaining a separation distance from the adjacent property at No. 8 Fordbank Road.

The front elevation would incorporate a door and window, with no fenestration proposed on the side or rear elevations.

At first floor level, the proposal would infill the area above the existing porch, aligning with both the original side wall and the principal front elevation of the dwelling, resulting in a flush and cohesive appearance. A window reflecting the design of the existing decorative porthole feature would be positioned on the front elevation.

Overall, given the positioning and orientation of the windows, it is not anticipated that the proposal would result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The windows are considered to be appropriately located so as to maintain the existing levels of residential amenity. As such, the proposal is deemed acceptable in this regard.

Given the modest scale and siting of the proposed extensions, it is considered that the development can be acceptably accommodated within the application site and would not detract from the established character or visual amenity of the surrounding area.

In summary, given the height, projection and relationship to adjacent properties, it is considered that the proportions of the extension are acceptable. The footprint is not considered to create a bulky or disproportionate scale addition to the property and therefore the development accords with Core Strategy Policy DM1 and saved policy DC1 of the UDP.

Scale and massing

The scale and massing of the proposal is considered would not cause undue harm to the current levels of amenity being enjoyed by the occupiers of surrounding properties. The extension is considered would not present an unusual feature in the immediate area due to the existence of other similar additions to a variety of house types in the immediate area. The size of the extension is considered acceptable within the surrounding environmental context and is not believed to provide an overbearing impact upon the residential amenities of surrounding properties.

It is therefore considered that the design, scale and appearance of the proposed extension is satisfactory and is considered to accord with the principles for residential extensions set out in saved UDP policy DC1, DM1 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.

Design

The design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing and surrounding properties in the area. In terms of the proposed materials, it is intended to use matching materials as specified in the application form which comprises brick, tile and render. The design of the extension has been tailored to fit the shape of the existing property/plot and respect the relationship with the neighbouring properties at the rear and is considered acceptable. It is believed that the proposed works would not detract from the character and appearance of the property, and the design of the works would complement the host dwelling detailed as what is normally expected of such a structure.

On balance it is considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development accords with Core Strategy Policies DM1 and EN1 and in general the design is considered acceptable

Waste management

The proposed development would have no impact on the existing arrangements for refuse and recycling storage. Bin storage provision will remain unchanged and continue to operate without obstruction or alteration.

Parking

Current parking arrangements are unaffected by this proposal.

Conclusion

The City Council considers that the character of the area has been retained although houses in the immediate vicinity are themselves altered and extended. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location and it is not considered that the proposal would create any undue loss of privacy, loss of light or have an overbearing impact upon neighbouring occupiers. Extensions to the front, side and rear are particularly popular in this area, therefore the appearance is acceptable and its impact upon visual amenity is considered negligible.

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in this location in terms of design, scale and massing, allowing the occupiers to adapt their home to meet their needs, without unduly detrimentally affecting the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate otherwise.

It is considered that the accords with saved UDP policy DC1, policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Other Legislative Requirements

Equality Act 2010

Section 149 (Public Sector Equality Duty) of the Equality Act 2010 requires due regard to the need to: Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and; Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The Equality Duty does not impose a legal requirement to conduct an Equality Impact Assessment. Compliance with the Equality Duty involves consciously thinking about the aims of the Equality Duty as part of the process of decision-making.

Human Rights Act 1998 considerations

This application needs to be considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6, the applicants (and those third parties, including local residents, who have made representations) have a right to a fair hearing and to this end the local planning authority must give full consideration to their comments.

Protocol 1 Article 1, and Article 8 where appropriate, confer(s) a right of respect for a person's home, other land and business assets. In taking account of all material considerations, including Council policy as set out in the Core Strategy and saved policies of the Unitary Development Plan, the Director of Planning, Building Control & Licensing has concluded that some rights conferred by these articles on the applicant(s)/objector(s)/resident(s) and other occupiers and owners of nearby land that might be affected may be interfered with but that that interference is in accordance with the law and justified by being in the public interest and on the basis of the planning merits of the development proposal. She believes that any restriction on these rights posed by the recommendation given is proportionate to the wider benefits of and that such a decision falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Recommendation: Approve

Article 35 Declaration

Positive and proactive working Officers have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner based on seeking solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. The application has been determined in a timely manner and in accordance with the policies within the Development Plan

Condition(s) to be attached to decision for approval OR Reasons for recommendation to refuse

1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason - Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents:

Received on 21st July 2025 numbered 04 Proposed Floor Plans
Received on 23rd October 2025 numbered 05 Proposed Elevations

Reason - To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Pursuant to policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing property and as stated on the Householder Application Form in type, size, colour and texture.

Reason - To ensure the appearance of the building to be extended is not adversely affected by the materials to be used in the construction of the extension, pursuant to saved policies DC1.1, DC1.2 and DC1.4 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policy DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy.

Informatives

1) If the development can accommodate it, it is requested that consideration is given to the installation of Swift Bricks. Swift bricks must be fitted in accordance to the specifications of BS 42021:2022 - Integral nest boxes.

Appendix 1 – List of consultees & neighbours notified

8 Fordbank Road, Manchester, M20 2TH
10 Fordbank Road, Manchester, M20 2TH
22 Whitehaven Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SY
24 Whitehaven Gardens, Manchester, M20 2SY
46 Deneford Road, Manchester, M20 2TD
37 Deneford Road, Manchester, M20 2TE
4 Fordbank Road, Manchester, M20 2TH
2 Fordbank Road, Manchester, M20 2TH

Appendix 2 – Planning constraints

Article 4 Direction - Removal Of PD Rights Change Of Use From Class C3 To Class C4
Area Team Boundary - Name: SOUTH AREA